UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,511	10/15/2003	Takeshi Nomura	396.43174X00	6734

20457 7590 10/09/2008
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873

EXAMINER	
PATTERSON, MARC A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1794	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

ADVISORY ACTION

Applicant's arguments filed September 25, 2008 have been fully considered but have not been found to be persuasive.

1. Applicant argues, on page 3 of the remarks dated September 3, 2008, that 20% of the claimed structure is not present in Hille et al.

However, as stated on page 2 of the previous Action, the polyurethane disclosed by Hille et al comprises an active hydrogen containing compound comprising polyol, as stated on page 12 of the instant specification, and a polyisocyanate that is a reaction product of an isocyanate and polyfunctional alcohol as stated on page 13 of the specification, and ratio of isocyanate groups to hydroxyl groups of 2 as stated on page 23 of the specification. Hille therefore discloses the claimed polyurethane; the polyurethane therefore has 20% of the claimed structure, and therefore the properties discussed by Applicant.

Applicant also argues, on page 6, that Hille et al fail to disclose the claimed gasoline permeability coefficient.

However, as stated on page 2 of the previous Action, because impermeability is inherent to Hille et al, the claimed permeability coefficient is inherent to Hille et al.

Applicant also argues, on page 8, that the previous Action mischaracterizes the declaration, and that the declaration provides experimental data showing differences in gasoline permeability coefficient, not permeability to gasoline in the gas phase.

However, the statement in the previous Action is intended as a response to Applicant's argument that the claimed invention is not disclosed by the prior art because gasoline must not permeate the claimed invention as a gas.

Applicant also argues, on page 9, that in general a polyurethane film is permeable to gasoline vapor and liquid gasoline.

However, as stated on page 2 of the previous Action, polyurethanes are impermeable to liquids, as taught by Kay.

Applicant also argues, on page 12, that the teachings of Hille et al would not have been properly combinable with the teachings of Hata et al, because Hata et al disclose an internal layer on a surface and this is not relevant to a decorative coating on a substrate surface.

However, as stated on page 2 of the previous Action, the combination of Hata et al and Hille et al is proper for the purpose of providing a decorative internal layer.

Applicant also argues on page 12 that Hata et al already disclose an internal layer of ethylene vinyl alcohol.

However, the ethylene vinyl alcohol layer is not relevant to providing the polyurethane of Hille et al on the inside surface of Hata et al, as stated in the previous Action, because the ethylene vinyl alcohol layer of Hata et al is not on the inside surface.

Applicant also argues, on page 13, that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have looked to Hille et al to solve the problem of the claimed invention.

However, as stated on page 2 of the previous Action, it would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art to provide for the polyurethane of Hille et al in Hata et al.

Applicant also argues, on page 17, that the declaration shows that the coating disclosed by Hille et al does not have the gasoline permeability coefficient of the claimed invention.

However, the declaration provides data for experiments on the examples of Hille et al, and Hille et al is not limited to the examples; furthermore, as stated above, because Hille et al discloses the claimed polyurethane.

Applicant also argues, on page 19, that Toyota et al is directed to a foam, and is therefore not properly combinable with Hata et al.

However, as stated on page 2 of the previous Action, Toyota et al is not limited to the making of a foam.

Applicant also argues, on page 20, that Ramanathan et al do not disclose a fuel barrier layer.

However, as stated on page 2 of the previous Action, Ramanathan et al is cited only for the teaching that a fuel vessel having a tube is well known to those of ordinary skill in the art.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc A Patterson whose telephone number is 571-272-1497. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Marc A Patterson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794